

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | Fl | LING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | . ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| 10/632,008 | 07/31/2003 | | Robert E. Richard | 02-263 | 9358 |
| 27774 | 7590 | 09/13/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| MAYER & | WILLIA | MS PC | KENNEDY, SHARON E | | |
| 251 NORTH | · · · | E WEST | | | |
| 2ND FLOOR | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| WESTFIELD, NJ 07090 | | | | 1615 | |
| | | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Assistant Commencer | 10/632,008 | RICHARD ET AL. | | | | | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sharon E. Kennedy | 1615 | | | | | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | _• | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar |) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | |
| | | | | | | * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other: | | | | | | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/632,008

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-23, drawn to an implantable or insertable device for the release of therapeutic agents comprising a silicone copolymer, classified in class 424, subclass 422.
- II. Claims 24-27, drawn to a method of making the implantable device via solvent evaporation, classified in class 427, subclass 2.14.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this case, the product as claimed can be prepared by another method, such an injection molding, compression molding, etc., as stated in applicant's published paragraph [0065] of US 2005/0027283. Layered/barrier devices can be produced by co-extruding the layers, painting, or dipping.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/632,008

Art Unit: 1615

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Keum J. Park on September 5, 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

Application/Control Number: 10/632,008

Art Unit: 1615

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharon E. Kennedy whose telephone number is 571/272-4948. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached on 571/272-8373.

Sharow Hennedy
Sharon E. Kennedy
Primary Examiner

Page 4

Art Unit 1615